

## STAFF REPORT

**To:** Planning Commission

**From:** Robert Johnson, Director

**Date:** November 9, 2010 – Submitted for Planning Commission work session  
November 23, 2010

**Subject:** Comprehensive Plan and County Code (Chapters 16.15 and 17.20 LCC)  
Amendments

---

### ISSUE

As part of the 2010 annual update, the County has engaged in a review of the Comprehensive Plan Land Use, Economic Development, and Capital Facilities Elements. This has been driven by the need to eliminate dated material, add more recent information, and create a policy framework for new initiatives. Associated development code amendments have also been proposed for creating zoning standards and procedures for regulating urban development in unincorporated Lewis County outside or city-affiliated urban growth areas.

### BACKGROUND

During 2009 and 2010, the County has engaged in several major planning efforts.

- A subarea planning process has been conducted in the South County area. This process is described in detail in the *Draft South County Subarea Plan* that has been heard by the Planning Commission. It is anticipated that further revisions will be made to the *Draft* before action is taken by the Board of County Commissioners in 2011.
- In parallel with the subarea planning, the County prepared a detailed transportation study of the South County area.

- The Cities of Toledo, Winlock, and Vader have been working with the County on an assessment of needs and strategies for providing utility services to the Cities and unincorporated county urban growth areas on a regional basis.
- A plan for future development of the Industrial Park at TransAlta (IPAT) has been prepared by the Lewis County Economic Development Council aimed at increasing the County's ability to attract large industrial users.

## COMPREHENSIVE PLAN AMENDMENTS

Staff is presenting amendments to the Comprehensive Plan Land Use Element, Economic Development Element and Profile, and the Capital Facilities Element and Profile, described below:

### Land Use Element

#### *Introduction (pages 4-1 through 4-3)*

- Added third paragraph in "Purpose" section to more precisely define land use distributions.
- Added GMA goals guiding the chapter
- Added reference to Master Planned Resorts in "Existing Land Use" section.
- Removed incomplete table and references to figures.

#### *Urban Growth Areas Sub-Element (pages 4-4 through 4-12)*

#### *& Rural Areas Sub-Element (pages 4-13 through 4-32)*

- Re-arranged structure to extract policy language from sections with existing regulatory-like language (such as sections titled "guidelines," "requirements," "issues," "designations," etc.)
- Preserved the intent of these deleted sections in the form of new proposed policy language.
- Clarified the intent for each land use designation.
- Urban Sub-Element: clustered policy language according to topic
- Rural Sub-Element: clustered policy language according to land use designation.
- Removed all definitions from descriptive text and from policies and placed into a glossary.
- Removed outdated information.
- Removed language referring to designation of Gateway Communities (due to inconsistencies with the use of "gateway" in Lewis County Code).
- Moved some language to the Economic Development Element (see Programmatic Approaches in Economic Development Element)
- Retained the intent and key concepts from of the existing document while attempting to make both sub-elements more accessible and reader-friendly.

#### *Land Use Urban and Rural Sub-Element Glossary (pages 4-33 through 4-37)*

- Created a glossary of terms extracted from the Urban and Rural Sub-Elements.
- Added definition for "Gateway."

### *Natural Resource Lands Sub-Element & Natural Environment Sub-Element*

- No Changes (not included in packet)

### Economic Development Element

- Introduction updated to include mention of Subarea Plan
- New section “Economic Impact”– moved here from Urban Land Use Sub-Element (page 3-1)
- Minor edits to CWPPs (page 3-2 through 3-3)
- Minor amendment to SWOT analysis:
  - Weaknesses: Concerning shortage of lands designated for all uses (page 3-6)
  - Opportunities: Updates concerning large-acreage industrial sites (page 3-7)
- New Section “Programmatic Approach”– moved here and edited from Urban Land Use Sub-Element (pages 3-9 through 3-11)
- Policy 2.2 reworded for clarification (page 3-13)
- New: Policy 3.12 added for compliance with GMA on redevelopment of surface coal mining land (page 3-15)
- Policy 4.3 reworded for clarification (page 3-15)
- Policy 6.4 reworded for clarification (page 3-18)
- Policy 6.7 reworded for clarification (page 3-19)
- Policy 6.11 deleted (page 3-19)
- New: Policies 6.11 and 6.12 added to enhance the economic vitality of farming practice (page 3-19 through 3-20)

### Capital Facilities & Utilities Element

- New Policy Added. CF 2.4 (page 7-6) to help set framework for regional utilities cooperation
- New Policy Added. U 1.7 (page 7-11) to help set framework for regional utilities & subarea planning
- New Policy Added. U 1.8 (page 7-11) proposed by Public Works, edited by BHC, to regulate regional utility management in compliance with GMA RCW 36.70A.110(4)
- Policy Amended: U 3.1 (page 7-12) proposed by Public Works to clarify agencies.

### Economic Profile

- Updates to population information ( page A1-31 and A3-31)
- New paragraph explaining Hovee study for industrial demand in South County subarea (page A21-31)
- New paragraph describing South County Subarea purchasing power (page A27-31)
- Addition of paragraph describing South County as a retail center (page A30-31)
- Addition of paragraph describing the economic contributions of the South County subarea (page A31-31)

### Capital Facilities & Utilities Profile

- Sentence added to introduction to reflect plans for regional utility system (page C2-28)
- Table 8.1, Inventory of County-Owned Buildings, updated to reflect public works facilities. Changes proposed by Public Works. (page C2-28)

- Numbers in Table 8.2 Projected Space Needs (pages C3-28 and C4-28) updated for 2030
- Information updated for Winlock, Toldeo, Evaline, Castle Rock, Napavine, and Chehalis school districts (pages C6-28 through C8-28)
- City of Vader water system information updated to reflect county acquisition (pages C12-28 through C13-28)
- Language changed for Solid Waste and Hazardous Waste Management Plan to reflect adoption in 2008 (page C17-28)
- Solid Waste Transfer Stations information updated to reflect discontinuation of drop box system. Changes proposed by Public Works. (page C18-28)
- Natural Gas updated to reflect recent upgrades at Jackson Prairie (pages C20-28 through C21-28)

## DEVELOPMENT CODE AMENDMENTS

Chapter 17.20 Urban Growth Areas – County is proposed to be amended to provide a basis for development in the following:

- Chapter 17.20A Industrial Land Bank Urban Growth Area includes current adopted provisions in 17.20.015, 17.20.020, 17.20.030, 17.20.040, and 17.20.050.
- Chapter 17.20B Master Planned Major Industrial Reclaimed Surface Coal Mine Urban Growth Area is a new chapter that establishes the basis for designating and regulating new development on the IPAT site.
- Chapter 17.20C Economic Development Urban Growth Areas is a new chapter that establishes the basis for designating and regulating new development in non-municipal Economic Development Urban Growth Areas established through subarea plans. A new zone “Economic Development District” is proposed for establishing the development standards and procedures for approvals of intensive development within the EDUGAs.
- Chapter 17.20D New Fully Contained Community Urban Growth Area includes current adopted provisions in 17.20.051 and 17.20.060.
- Chapter 17.20E Master Planned Resorts is a new chapter that establishes the basis for designating and regulating development in large scale urban master planned resorts, consistent with the GMA.

Each of these chapters addresses the unique approaches necessary to accommodate effective permitting and approval procedures for the individual types of urban growth.

Chapter 16.15 Binding Site Plans is proposed to be amended to provide standards for applications and County review and approval of proposed sector plans in the Economic Development UGAs. This is revision to the current chapter.

## **ADOPTION PROCESS**

A SEPA Environmental Checklist was prepared by staff, dated October 13, 2010. A SEPA Determination of Non-significance will be made on the date that the Planning Commission transmits final recommendations to the Board of County Commissioners.

The proposed amendments were transmitted to the state Department of Commerce, Growth Management Division for GMA review on October 14, 2010.

The Planning Commission held a workshop on October 26, 2010 during which the amendments were introduced and discussed.

The Planning Commission will hold a public hearing on the amendments on November 9, 2010 to take public testimony on the amendments. The hearing was duly noticed, and the proposed amendments were placed in the required public access locations per Chapter 17.12 LCC.

Following the public hearing, the Planning Commission will deliberate on the proposals and transmit its recommendations to the Board of County Commissioners for action.

## **NOTE:**

BHC Consultants has prepared revised drafts of the Comprehensive Plan and Development Code amendments. These are labeled “workshop materials”. They include the changes suggested by Andy Lane on behalf of IPAT, the comments from Public Works, and suggested comments provided by the commissioners. Both of these were entered into the record at the October 26 Planning Commission workshop. The intent of the “workshop materials” is to enable the Planning Commission to have the most up-to-date and consolidated drafts.